

BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN (MUMBAI)

(Appointed by the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission
under Section 42(6) of the Electricity Act, 2003)

REPRESENTATION NO. 115 OF 2025

In the matter of billing of agricultural connection

Chandrashekhar Rajendra Patil (Son of Consumer)Appellant
(Late Rajendra Ramchandra Patil - Cons. No. 275922311918)

V/s.

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd., Vita Dn.... Respondent
(MSEDCL)

Appearances:

Appellant : Chandrashekhar Rajendra Patil

Respondent : 1. Vinayak P. Idate, Executive Engineer, Vita Dn.
2. Kiran D. Doiphode, Dy. Executive Engineer, Kadegaon Sub Dn.
3. Nisar S. Shikalgar, Jr. Law Officer, Sangli Circle.
4. Swaroop P. Nakate, Asst. Accountant, Kadegaon Sub Dn.


Coram: Vandana Krishna [IAS (Retd.)]

Date of hearing: 16th January 2026

Date of Order: 23rd February 2026

ORDER

This Representation was filed on 15th December 2025 under Regulation 19.1 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2020 (CGRF & EO Regulations 2020) against the Order dated 16th October 2025 (Case No. 02 of 2025-26) passed by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum,


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



MSEDCL, Sangli Circle (the Forum). The Forum, by its order, partly allowed the grievance application filed by the Appellant. The operative portion of the said order (issued in Marathi) reads as follows:

“The Respondent is directed to:

2.Revise the Complainant’s electricity bills with effect from 09.03.2021 onwards.

3.Permanently disconnect the agricultural connection forthwith, under due intimation to the Complainant.”


2. Aggrieved by the order passed by the Forum, the Appellant has filed the present representation. An online hearing was held on 16.01.2026 through video conference. Parties were heard at length. The Respondent’s submissions and arguments are stated as below: - *[The Electricity Ombudsman’s observations and comments are recorded under ‘Notes.]*

- (i) The Appellant is an agricultural consumer. The details of his agricultural connection are tabulated below:

Table 1:

Name of Consumer	Consumer No.	Address	Sanctioned load	Date of Supply	Activity
Rajendra Ramchandra Patil	275922311918	Gat No. 725, Hingangaon Khurd, At Post:Tadsar, Tal: Kadegaon, Dist.: Sangli	3 HP	13.01.2017	Agricultural


- (ii) The meter installed at the premises of the Appellant was of Kaifa make bearing Serial No. 60282858. The Appellant has annexed a photocopy of the electricity bill for September 2018, which contains a remark stating “meter found burnt, second well, no use found,” along with a signature dated 22.11.2018. However,


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



the said signature does not bear any name or official stamp, and the identity of the person who recorded and signed the remark is not ascertainable. As per the said bill, the meter reading recorded on 29.10.2018 was 6559 kWh, whereas the previous reading recorded on 11.08.2018 was 5654 kWh, reflecting a consumption of 905 units during the relevant billing period (3 months). The Appellant did not pay any bills till date from the date of supply i.e. from 13.01.2017. The Appellant paid only Rs. 570/- on account against outstanding bill of Rs. 7890/-. The bill accumulated from 13.01.2017 to Sep. 2018.


- (iii) The Xerox copies of the following documents produced by the Appellant are unreliable and unsupported by official record.
- a. **Letter dated 16.08.2017:** The letter alleging mango cultivation, water in bore well, shock complaint, and request for meter replacement and restoration of supply does not bear any official inward number or acknowledgment. There is no proof of its submission or receipt.
 - b. **Bill of September 2018:** The handwritten remark stating that the meter was burnt, second well existed, and no use was found, bears only an unidentified signature without name or stamp. The authenticity of the endorsement is not established.
 - c. **Another xerox letter:** The letter stating no water in bore well, no use of electricity, and seeking revision of bill of Rs. 7,880/- also does not bear any inward number or official remark. Its receipt by the Respondent is not proved.
- (iv) The Appellant, for the first time, addressed a letter dated 09.03.2021 to the Section Engineer stating that he did not require the agricultural connection any further as he was not in need of electricity at present and requested temporary disconnection of supply. The said letter bears only a signature noted as "AE


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



Kadegaon” without any official stamp. No further correspondence in that regard is available on record.

- (v) By letter dated 23.08.2022, addressed to the Deputy Executive Engineer, Kadegaon, the Appellant alleged fictitious billing to the extent of Rs. 30,010/- on the ground that no supply was used and requested revision of the bill along with compensation of Rs.50,000/-. The Appellant had also requested MRI Data of the meter. The said letter bears an inward stamp.
- (vi) Thereafter, further correspondence was made with MSEDCL by the Appellant’s son seeking revision of bills on the basis of the above references.
- (vii) The Respondent carried out a site inspection on 15.01.2025, during which it was observed that the meter was burnt and its display was not functioning. The Site Engineer recommended revision of the bills from 09.03.2021 onwards considering non-use.
- (viii) The Respondent had carried out billing as per actual meter readings up to March 2020. From April 2020 onwards, (Covid Period) billing was done proportionately by considering agricultural consumption for 3 HP on a pro-rata basis, calculated from the common meter installed on the HT feeder at the substation and the total connected load.
- (ix) The Appellant filed a grievance application before the Forum on 01.09.2025. The Forum, by its order, partly allowed the grievance and directed the Respondent to revise the electricity bills with effect from 09.03.2021 onwards, considering permanent disconnection of the agricultural connection.
- (x) Accordingly, the Appellant’s bill amount was revised from Rs. 80,348/- (bill up to September 2025) to Rs. 31,375/-, and a credit of Rs. 48,973/- was given in December 2025. The supply has since been permanently disconnected in the system and all bills from March 2021 onwards have been withdrawn.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- (xi) The consumption pattern of the Appellant, based on quarterly billing (three-month cycle) for the period from March 2017 to March 2020, during which billing was carried out as per actual meter readings, is tabulated below:

Table 2:


Year	2016-17			2017-18			2018-19			2019-20		
Month	Current Reading (kWh)	Previous Reading (kWh)	Cons. (Units)	Current Reading (kWh)	Previous Reading (kWh)	Cons. (Units)	Current Reading (kWh)	Previous Reading (kWh)	Cons. (Units)	Current Reading (kWh)	Previous Reading (kWh)	Cons. (Units)
Jun				1	1	300*	5654	4425	1229	11365	9449	1916
Sep				1390	1	1389	6559	5654	905	12265	11365	900
Dec				2947	1390	1557	7959	6559	1400	13615	12265	1350
Mar	1	1	260*	4425	2947	1478	9449	7959	1490	13615	13615	1719
Note	1. In March & June 2017, billed under Reading Not Available (RNA) status, and in Sep.2017 billed for accumulated consumption with proper credit through system. 2. In March 2020 billed under RNA Status											

- (xii) After this period, the consumption pattern of the Appellant, based on quarterly billing (three-month cycle) and calculated on a pro-rata basis by considering agricultural indexing of consumption recorded on the common meter, is tabulated below:

Table 3:

Year	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Month	Cons. (Units)	Cons. (Units)	Cons. (Units)	Cons. (Units)	Cons. (Units)	Cons. (Units)
Jun	1179	1049	1029	1267	1016	1040
Sep	642	871	624	1188	409	720
Dec	869	816	870	1033	934	1148
Mar	1074	938	1178	1188	1250	

- (xiii) The Appellant has paid only a single amount of Rs. 57/- on 22.11.2020 towards the said consumer account against billing from March 2017 onwards up to December 2025. This is the only payment made till date.


 (Dilip Dumbre)
 Secretary
 Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- (xiv) The Appellant approached the Forum on 01.09.2025. The cause of action prior to 01.09.2023 (retrospective two years) is time barred as per Regulation 6.6/7.8 of CGRF & EO Regulations 2006/2020. The relevant regulation is reproduced as below:

The Forum shall not admit any Grievance unless it is filed within two (2) years from the date on which the cause of action has arisen.

- (xv) The Respondent relied on order dated 25.09.2019 of Electricity Ombudsman (Mumbai) in Rep. No. 147 of 2019 in Case of Ajanta Universal Fabrics Ltd. V/s MSEDCL Satara. The Ombudsman observed that


“It was also incumbent upon the Appellant to have done due diligence in approaching the grievance redressal mechanism available to it under rules and regulations. On the contrary, the Appellant engaged in writing letters to various authorities. Therefore, the instant representation is time barred in view of provisions of Regulation 6.6 of the CGRF Regulations under which the Forum has decided the case. However, as and when the subsidy is released by the GoM, it will be passed on to the Appellant.

In view of this discussion, I do not find it necessary to interfere with the order of the Forum. Therefore, the representation is disposed of accordingly.”

- (xvi) In view of the above facts and the revision already carried out, the basic grievance of the Appellant stands resolved. The Respondent, therefore, prays that the representation of the Appellant be rejected.


3. The Appellant’s submissions and arguments are stated as below:

- (i) The Appellant is an agricultural consumer. The details of electric connection are tabulated in Table 1. The present representation is filed by Shri Chandrashekhar Rajendra Patil, son of the original consumer, challenging the order passed by the Forum.
- (ii) The deceased father of the Appellant had, from time to time, lodged several complaints with the local authorities of MSEDCL, as under:


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- a) By letter dated 16.08.2017, he reported an electric shock complaint and requested replacement of the meter and restoration of supply. The connection was reportedly used only during the initial six months. However, no corrective action was taken by the Respondent.
- b) The bill of September 2018 bears handwritten remarks dated 22.11.2018 stating that the meter was burnt, a second well existed, and no use was found, indicating knowledge of the defective meter; however, no formal action was taken.
- c) By letter dated 09.03.2021, the consumer requested temporary disconnection of the agricultural supply as the electricity was not required.
- d) By letter dated 23.08.2022 addressed to the Deputy Executive Engineer, Kadegaon, the consumer alleged fictitious billing of Rs. 30,010/- despite non-use of supply, sought provision of MRI data, revision of the bill, and compensation of Rs. 50,000/-.
- (iii) Thereafter, the Appellant (son of the consumer) lodged a complaint on 04.03.2025 seeking revision of the bill from September 2018 onwards and also requested permanent disconnection of supply.
- (iv) The Appellant filed a grievance application before the Forum on 01.09.2025. The Forum partly allowed the grievance and directed the Respondent to revise the electricity bills with effect from 09.03.2021 onwards, considering permanent disconnection of the agricultural connection.
- (v) **Grounds for Revision of Bill:**
- A. Failure to issue bills as per actual meter readings.
 - B. Non-replacement of the burnt meter noted on 22.11.2018.
 - C. Non-compliance with the request for permanent disconnection.
 - D. Violation of the Standards of Performance requiring resolution of complaints within seven days.
 - E. Continuous harassment and deficiency in service since 2017, despite repeated representations.



(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



(vi) In view of the aforesaid facts and grounds, the Appellant prays that this Hon'ble Ombudsman be pleased to direct the Respondent to issue correct bills as per actual meter readings and to grant Standards of Performance compensation from 16.08.2017 at the rate of Rs. 100/- per week till date.


Analysis and Ruling

4. Heard the parties and perused the documents on record.
5. The meter installed at the Appellant's premises was of Kaifa make bearing Serial No. 60282858. The Appellant has relied upon a photocopy of the electricity bill of September 2018 containing a handwritten remark dated 22.11.2018 stating "meter found burnt, second well, no use found." According to the Respondent, the said remark bears only a signature without name or official stamp and the identity of the person might be of a very junior level which is not ascertainable.
6. As per the September 2018 bill, the meter reading recorded on 29.10.2018 was 6559 kWh as against the previous reading of 5654 kWh recorded on 11.08.2018, reflecting consumption of 905 units during the relevant three-month billing period. It is observed that from the date of supply, i.e., 13.01.2017, the Appellant did not regularly pay electricity bills. Only a nominal amount of Rs. 570/- (as per record) was paid on 22.11.2018 against accumulated dues.
7. The Appellant contended that there is documentary proof as below:
 - Letter dated 16.08.2017 alleging "shock" complaint and requesting meter replacement and restoration of supply;
 - Bill of September 2018 containing handwritten remarks regarding burnt meter;
 - Another letter alleging no use of supply and seeking revision of bill of Rs.7,880/-.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



8. None of the above documents bear official inward numbers or authenticated acknowledgment of receipt, except the letter dated 23.08.2022. Therefore, their evidentiary value is limited. The Appellant, for the first time, formally addressed a letter dated 09.03.2021 requesting temporary disconnection of supply on the ground of non-requirement of electricity. By letter dated 23.08.2022 addressed to the Deputy Executive Engineer, the Appellant alleged fictitious billing and sought revision of bill. The Respondent carried out site inspection on 15.01.2025 and found the meter burnt and display not functioning.
9. The Respondent carried out billing as per actual meter readings up to March 2020. The billing up to March 2020 was based on actual recorded meter readings reflecting measurable consumption. From April 2020 onwards, billing was done on a pro-rata basis considering agricultural indexing of consumption based on the common HT feeder meter and connected load. The Forum directed revision of bills from 09.03.2021 onwards, considering the Appellant's request of temporary disconnection. In compliance, the Respondent revised the bill from Rs. 80,348/- (up to September 2025 ending) to Rs. 31,375/- by withdrawing bills from March 2021 onwards and has passed on credit of Rs. 48,973/- in the bill of December 2025. The agricultural supply has been permanently disconnected in the system in Dec. 2025.
10. The Appellant approached the Forum on 01.09.2025. In terms of Regulation 6.6/7.8 of the CGRF & EO Regulations, 2006/2020, a period of grievance before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Mechanism is legally available only of (2) years, i.e. from 01.09.2023 onwards. Hence the grievance relating to the period, prior to 01.09.2023 is barred by limitation and cannot be entertained at this juncture. It was mandatory upon the Appellant to exercise due diligence by availing the grievance redressal mechanism in the time frame prescribed under the applicable rules and regulations. Instead, the Appellant merely addressed representations to various authorities. Consequently, in terms of Regulation 7.8 of the CGRF Regulations, the part of the grievance relating to the period before 01.09.2023 is barred by limitation. It is also important to


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




note that the Appellant has made only one nominal payment of Rs. 570/- from the date of connection during the entire period.

11. The Forum has already given a reasoned and speaking order. Hence no interference in the Forum's order is necessary. In view of the revision already made in the bill and permanent disconnection effected, the primary grievance stands substantially redressed. The action taken by the Respondent in revising the bills from 09.03.2021 onwards and granting credit of Rs. 48,973/- is upheld. In view of the foregoing discussion and material on record, the representation of the Appellant is rejected.

12. The Secretariat of this office is directed to refund Rs. 20,000/- paid by the Appellant to the Respondent for adjusting in the bill.

Sd/
(Vandana Krishna)
Electricity Ombudsman (Mumbai)


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai

